

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of September 13, 2005, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1-71 have been cancelled. Claims 72-101 have been added. No new matter has been added. Claims 72-101 remain pending after entry of the present amendment. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Applicant thanks the Examiner for indicating the typographic error. This objection is rendered moot due to the cancellation of the effected claims.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 14, 25-39 and 58-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112 as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Since the rejected claims have been cancelled, this rejection is rendered moot.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 14, 25-39 and 58-71 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Birenback *et al.* (U.S. patent No. 6,594,704, hereinafter “Birenback”). Since claims 1, 14, 25-39 and 58-71 have been cancelled, this rejection is rendered moot. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant will discuss Birenback in view of new claims 72-101.

New Claims

New independent claim 72 recites, *inter alia*, “maintaining a connection and sustaining one or more application sessions with the mobile node upon detecting movement of the mobile node in accordance with a predefined routing protocol, wherein maintaining a connection further comprises maintaining a stable IP address for the mobile node.” Nowhere does Birenback teach or suggest such a feature. Birenback relates to a method for maintaining multiple routing tables within a global table of a network router. However, Birenback fails to teach or suggest maintaining a connection and sustaining application sessions with a mobile node when the mobile node moves from one network sink to another network sink. In fact, Birenback lacks any

Appln. No.: 09/755,027
Reply to Office Action of September 13, 2005

teaching or suggestion of a mobile node migrating from one mobility router or sink to another mobility router or sink. At most, Birenback discloses storing routing information and performing lookups using a routing table. Col. 4, line 39 – Col. 5, line 50. Even so, merely managing and organizing routing information is not comparable to *routing protocols* and more specifically, the process of managing mobile node handovers *while maintaining a connection and sustaining active application sessions* as is recited in claim 72. As such, claim 72 is allowable for at least this reason.

Claims 73-101 are dependent on claim 72 and are thus allowable for the same reasons as claim 72 and further in view of the novel and non-obvious features recited therein.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3156.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: February 13, 2006

By: 
Chunhsing Andy Mu, Reg. No. 58,216

1001 G Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001-4597
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

DRG/CAM